

SECTION I
COVER PAGE

RECEIVED

DEC 9 1 2007

OFFICE OF THE
ATTORNEY GENERAL
STATE OF NEW YORK

Washington County

Juvenile Services

Comprehensive Plan

December 2007 to December 2010

Completed By: Shurie R. Graeve
Washington County Attorney
1555 Colfax Street
Blair, NE 68008
Phone: (402) 426-6811
Fax: (402) 426-6826
Email: countyattorneyoffice@washingtoncountyne.org

Chair of the Community
Team/Coalition Shurie R. Graeve
Washington County Attorney

County Team Washington County
1555 Colfax Street
Blair, NE 68008
Phone: (402) 426-6811
Fax: (402) 426-6826
Email: countyattorneyoffice@washingtoncountyne.org

Chair of the County Board Duane "Harlo" Wilcox
Washington County Board of Supervisors
111 West 4th Street
P.O. Box 176
Kennard, NE 68034
Phone: (402) 427-7381

SECTION II

COMMUNITY TEAM

Community Team Name:**Washington County Juvenile Services Comprehensive Plan Team****Description of Team Function, Meetings and Current Structure:**

The Washington County Juvenile Services Comprehensive Plan Team consists of representatives from various agencies in the County that work directly with juveniles. The members represent the County's School Districts, Law Enforcement, Behavior Health Care Region VI, Probation, County Attorney, and Health & Human Services and Office of Juvenile Services. The **Team** has met several times over the course of the 2006-2007 year and will continue to meet as needed to address local juvenile issues that arise. Currently, the **Team** consists of one committee, with no sub-committees. The Project Director is responsible for organizing and facilitating the meetings. The **Team** generally meets on the second Friday of the month at noon at the Courthouse

The **Team** meets in conjunction with the Washington County LB 1184 Juvenile Task Force.

List of Community Team Members:

Shurie R. Graeve Project Director	Washington County Attorney 1555 Colfax Street Blair, NE 68008 (402) 426-6811 countyattorneyoffice@washingtoncountyne.org
Fred Carritt School Resource Officer	Washington County Sheriff's Office 1535 Colfax Street Blair, NE 68008 (402) 426-6866
Brent Cudley Assistant Principal Jr.-Sr. High School	Arlington Public Schools 705 North 9 th Street Arlington, NE 68002 (402) 478-4171 x-167 bcudley@esu3.org
Mark Gutschow Assistant Principal Otte Middle School	Blair Community Schools P.O. Box 288 Blair, NE 68008 (402) 426-3678 mark.gutschow@blairschools.org
Lisa Jones Guidance Counselor K-2 Elementary Schools	Blair Community Schools P.O. Box 288 Blair, NE 68008 (402) 490-8259 lisa.jones@blairschools.org

Karen Gengenbach
Guidance Counselor
High School

Blair Community Schools
P.O. Box 288
Blair, NE 68008
(402) 427-2888
karen.gengenbach@blairschools.org

Dave Westerholt
School Resource Officer

Blair Police Department
1730 Lincoln Street
Blair, NE 68008
(402) 426-6685
dwestersholt@ci.blair.ne.us

Patty Lyon
Senior Probation Officer

Probation District Sixteen
State of Nebraska
1555 Colfax Street
Blair, NE 68008
(402) 426-6818
patty.lyon@nsc.ne.gov

Shane Bruns
Intake Coordinator

Behavior Health Care Region VI
3801 Harney Street
Omaha, NE 68131
(402) 996-8377
sbruns@regionsix.com

Judy Hassler

Behavior Health Care Region VI
3801 Harney Street
Omaha, NE 68131
(402) 996-8389
jhassler@regionsix.com

Cathy Nolte
Lead Teacher

Fort Calhoun Schools
Pioneer Learning Center
1506 Lincoln Street
Fort Calhoun, NE 68023
(402) 468-1553
cnolte@esu3.org

Robert Denton
Chief Probation Officer

Probation District Sixteen
State of Nebraska
320 North Main Street
Fremont, NE 68025
(402) 727-2790
robert.denton@nsc.ne.gov

Lori Aman
Protection & Safety Worker
Health & Human Services
Office of Juvenile Services
1555 Colfax Street
Blair, NE 68008
(402) 426-2329 x-107
lori.aman@hhss.ne.gov

Nadine Reyes
Protection & Safety Worker
Health & Human Services
Office of Juvenile Services
1555 Colfax Street
Blair, NE 68008
(402) 426-2329 x-108
nadine.reyes@hhss.ne.gov

Joseph C. Bradley
Deputy County Attorney
Washington County Attorney's Office
1555 Colfax Street
Blair, NE 68008
(402) 426-6811
countyattorneyoffice@washingtoncountyne.org

SECTION III

COMMUNITY PLANNING TOOL

The Community Planning Tool was completed by the Washington County Juvenile Services Comprehensive Plan Team with assistance from Jennifer Meyer, consultant from the University of Nebraska at Lincoln, in January of 2007. A copy of the Community Planning Decision Point Analysis is attached as Appendix A.

In review of the Community Planning Decision Point Analysis, the **Team** identified strengths and weaknesses for youth services in Washington County. Through this process, the **Team** recognized five areas of priority for juvenile services within Washington County and they are listed in the following section. The **Team** also developed five strategies in coordination with the priorities identified and these strategies are outlined in Section V.

See attached Appendix A.

SECTION IV

COMMUNITY SOCIO-ECONOMICS

Washington County includes Blair (County Seat), Fort Calhoun, Arlington, Kennard, Herman and Washington. Blair sits alongside the Missouri River, just thirty minutes north of Omaha. Blair has one of only two highway bridges crossing between Omaha and Sioux City, Iowa and the only railway bridge that serves the Union Pacific Railroad. Blair also has four highways that intersect there which include U.S. Highways 75 and 30 and Nebraska Highways 91 and 133. These four highways have helped Blair and Washington County to become a hub of commerce that provides fast and easy access to both rural and metropolitan communities within the region. Interstate 29 is only a ten minute drive east from Blair and Interstate 680 is only a 15 minute drive south on either Highway 75 or 133. Washington County has assembled an impressive and diverse array of businesses. These businesses range from small storefronts to high tech communications firms and even major industrial companies with national and international ties. Businesses include: Woodhouse Auto Family, Cargill, Incorporated, Evonik Degussa Corporation, Nature Works, Monsanto Corporation, Buhler Industries, Omaha Public Power District (Fort Calhoun Nuclear Power Station), Wilkinson Manufacturing, Eriksen Construction Company, Luxa Construction Company, Mid America Computer Corporation, Mutual of Omaha, McKinnis Roofing and Sheet Metal, Fernando's Mexican Cantina, JASA Transit, Great Plains Communications, Kelly Ryan Equipment Company, Concrete Equipment Company and HunTel Systems. This is just a small sampling of the over 800 businesses that exist in Washington County.

With an increased population of 13.1% from 1990 to 2000 and a current population of 19,918, Washington County continues to be a growing community. The ethnic makeup of Washington County is predominately white at 97.2% with other ethnic categories accounting for the remaining 2.8%. 60.4% of Washington County residents are between the ages of 20 and 64 with the median age being 38.2. The average household income is \$61,878 with an employment rate of 96.9%.

There are three school districts in Washington County with 92% of Washington County residents having at least a high school diploma and 24.4% having a Bachelor's degree or higher.

Blair is one of the 25 largest school districts in the State of Nebraska and maintains the highest accreditation from the Nebraska State Department of Education, as well as membership in the North Central Association of Schools and Colleges. The patrons of the Blair Community School District have made a commitment to quality education and this is reflected by the excellent facilities available to our students. The three K-2 elementary schools have recently been remodeled. Arbor Park Middle School (grades 3-5) opened in the fall of 1990, and Gerald Otte Blair Middle School (grades 6-8) opened in the fall of 1997. Blair High School opened to students in 1970, and received the prestigious Secondary School Recognition Award for Excellence from the U.S. Department of Education in 1989. The school district of Blair encompasses over 142 square miles and serves the Northeastern portion of Washington County, including the city of Blair.

Fort Calhoun school district consists of a high school and an elementary school with a student population of approximately 600.

Arlington Public Schools is a K-12 district located with a student population of 600.

Washington County is also fortunate to benefit educationally, culturally and economically from the presence of Dana College, a four-year liberal arts college whose students come from across the nation.

Residents of Washington County enjoy an exceptional quality of life. Young and old, outdoor enthusiasts and cultural devotees will find pursuits to fulfill their interests and enrich their lives.

Golfers for miles around come to River Wilds Golf Course to tackle the challenging, 18-hole layout with glimpses of the Missouri River. The Missouri River provides a seasonal playground for boaters and fishermen. The nearby DeSoto Bend Wildlife Refuge also offers outstanding fishing, hiking trails and the incredible sight of hundreds of migrating geese each fall.

Youth play a major role in Washington County's recreational opportunities. The youth of Washington County enjoy the best sports facilities in the region for baseball, softball and soccer. Swimming pools, parks, playgrounds and even a skateboard park are available.

For fitness, the Blair Family YMCA is one of the Midwest's premier facilities, providing exercise programs and equipment, year-round swimming, youth and family programs and more.

A bowling alley, movie theater and a selection of restaurants make an evening out both pleasurable and affordable.

The Washington County Historical Museum and exhibits at the DeSoto Bend Visitors Center offer a look at early life in the area. Historic Fort Atkinson is also a major attraction, sitting atop the "council bluff" where the famous Lewis and Clark Expedition camped.

In Washington County, we have a spirit of partnership – communities reaching out to businesses, organizations reaching out to local government – to bridge gaps and accomplish great things - things such as programs, institutions and community development. Washington County is a wonderful place to live, raise a family, work and play!



greater omaha chamber of commerce

Date: 03/28/07

Current Geography Selection: (1 Selected) Counties: Washington County

Demographic Detail Summary Report

Population Demographics

	1990 Census		2000 Census		2006 Estimate		2011 Projection		Percent Change	
									1990 to 2000	2006 to 2011
Total Population	16,607		18,780		19,918		20,824		13.1%	4.5%
Population Density (Pop/ Sq Mi)	42.2		47.7		50.6		52.9		13.1%	4.5%
Total Households	6,017		6,940		7,606		8,147		15.3%	7.1%
Population by Gender:										
Male	8,136	49.0%	9,329	49.7%	9,987	50.1%	10,505	50.5%	14.7%	5.2%
Female	8,471	51.0%	9,451	50.3%	9,931	49.9%	10,319	49.6%	11.6%	3.9%

Population by Race/Ethnicity

	1990 Census		2000 Census		2006 Estimate		2011 Projection		Percent Change	
									1990 to 2000	2006 to 2011
White	16,403	98.8%	18,427	98.1%	19,365	97.2%	20,043	96.3%	12.3%	3.5%
Black	85	0.5%	63	0.3%	95	0.5%	117	0.6%	-25.9%	23.2%
American Indian or Alaska Native	39	0.2%	38	0.2%	25	0.1%	16	0.1%	-2.6%	-36.0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	34	0.2%	76	0.4%	85	0.4%	114	0.5%	123.5%	34.1%
Some Other Race	46	0.3%	57	0.3%	110	0.6%	240	1.2%	23.9%	118.2%
Two or More Races			119	0.6%	238	1.2%	294	1.4%		23.5%
Hispanic Ethnicity	104	0.6%	202	1.1%	244	1.2%	280	1.3%	94.2%	14.8%
Not Hispanic or Latino	16,502	99.4%	18,578	98.9%	19,674	98.8%	20,544	98.7%	12.6%	4.4%

Population by Age

	1990 Census		2000 Census		2006 Estimate		2011 Projection		Percent Change	
									1990 to 2000	2006 to 2011
0 to 4	1,062	6.4%	1,207	6.4%	1,102	5.5%	1,089	5.2%	13.7%	-1.2%
5 to 14	2,728	16.4%	2,902	15.5%	2,593	13.0%	2,409	11.6%	6.4%	-7.1%
15 to 19	1,295	7.8%	1,581	8.4%	1,509	7.6%	1,419	6.8%	22.1%	-6.0%
20 to 24	932	5.6%	1,139	6.1%	1,631	8.2%	1,564	7.5%	22.2%	-4.1%
25 to 34	2,338	14.1%	1,950	10.4%	2,454	12.3%	3,116	15.0%	-16.6%	27.0%
35 to 44	2,658	16.0%	3,057	16.3%	2,530	12.7%	2,218	10.7%	15.0%	-12.3%
45 to 54	1,817	10.9%	2,849	15.2%	3,065	15.4%	3,067	14.7%	56.8%	0.1%
55 to 64	1,520	9.2%	1,670	8.9%	2,347	11.8%	2,871	13.8%	9.9%	22.3%
65 to 74	1,156	7.0%	1,263	6.7%	1,377	6.9%	1,684	8.1%	9.3%	22.3%
75 to 84	790	4.8%	798	4.3%	928	4.7%	980	4.7%	1.0%	5.6%
85+	305	1.8%	364	1.9%	382	1.9%	407	2.0%	19.3%	6.5%
Median Age:										
Total Population	34.8		37.1		38.2		38.7		6.7%	1.2%

Households by Income

Percent Change

	1990 Census		2000 Census		2006 Estimate		2011 Projection		1990 to 2000	2006 to 2011
\$0 - \$15,000	1,174	19.5%	702	10.1%	664	8.7%	662	8.1%	-40.2%	-0.3%
\$15,000 - \$24,999	1,404	23.3%	829	11.9%	767	10.1%	750	9.2%	-41.0%	-2.2%
\$25,000 - \$34,999	921	15.3%	899	13.0%	870	11.4%	898	11.0%	-2.4%	3.2%
\$35,000 - \$49,999	1,272	21.1%	1,127	16.2%	1,092	14.4%	1,056	13.0%	-11.4%	-3.3%
\$50,000 - \$74,999	797	13.2%	1,747	25.2%	1,828	24.0%	1,777	21.8%	285.7%	-2.8%
\$75,000 - \$99,999	278	4.6%	834	12.0%	1,104	14.5%	1,320	16.2%	200.0%	19.6%
\$100,000 - \$149,999	85	1.4%	633	9.1%	951	12.5%	1,175	14.4%	644.7%	23.6%
\$150,000 +	71	1.2%	169	2.4%	330	4.3%	509	6.2%	138.0%	54.2%
Average Hhld Income	\$36,160		\$55,670		\$61,878		\$66,995		54.0%	8.3%
Median Hhld Income	\$29,736		\$48,907		\$55,055		\$59,699		64.5%	8.4%
Per Capita Income	\$13,191		\$20,572		\$24,325		\$26,884		56.0%	10.5%

Employment and Business

	1990 Census		2000 Census		2006 Estimate		2011 Projection		Percent Change	
									1990 to 2000	2006 to 2011
Age 16 + Population	12,568		14,340		15,933		17,048		14.1%	7.0%
In Labor Force	8,855	70.5%	10,513	73.3%	11,673	73.3%	12,477	73.2%	18.7%	6.9%
Employed	8,551	96.6%	10,163	96.7%	11,307	96.9%	12,089	96.9%	18.9%	6.9%
Unemployed	299	3.4%	343	3.3%	358	3.1%	381	3.1%	14.7%	6.4%
In Armed Forces	9	0.1%	7	0.1%	8	0.1%	7	0.0%	-22.2%	-12.5%
Not In Labor Force	3,713	29.5%	3,827	26.7%	4,252	26.7%	4,564	26.8%	3.1%	7.3%
Number of Employees (Daytime Pop)					8,112					
Number of Establishments					845					
Emp in Blue Collar Occupations			3,934	38.7%						
Emp in White Collar Occupations			6,229	61.3%						

Housing Units

	1990 Census		2000 Census		2006 Estimate		2011 Projection		Percent Change	
									1990 to 2000	2006 to 2011
Total Housing Units	6,377		7,408		8,000		8,467		16.2%	5.8%
Owner Occupied	4,507	70.7%	5,360	72.4%	5,970	74.6%	6,470	76.4%	18.9%	8.4%
Renter Occupied	1,511	23.7%	1,580	21.3%	1,636	20.5%	1,677	19.8%	4.6%	2.5%
Vacant	361	5.7%	468	6.3%	394	4.9%	320	3.8%	29.6%	-18.8%

Vehicles Available

	1990 Census		2000 Census		2006 Estimate		2011 Projection		Percent Change	
									1990 to 2000	2006 to 2011
Average Vehicles Per Hhld	2.20		2.00		2.30		2.50		-6.8%	11.8%
0 Vehicles Available	307	4.9%	294	4.2%	272	3.6%	249	3.1%	-4.2%	-8.5%
1 Vehicle Available	1,443	23.2%	1,683	24.3%	1,676	22.0%	1,663	20.4%	16.6%	-0.8%
2+ Vehicles Available	4,471	71.9%	4,963	71.5%	5,658	74.4%	6,235	76.5%	11.0%	10.2%

Marital Status

	1990 Census		2000 Census		2006 Estimate		2011 Projection		Percent Change	
									1990 to 2000	2006 to 2011
Age 15+ Population	12,811		14,671		16,223		17,326		14.5%	6.8%

Married, Spouse Present	8,323	65.0%	8,996	61.3%	9,974	61.5%	10,676	61.6%	8.1%	7.0%
Married, Spouse Absent	87	0.7%	477	3.3%	514	3.2%	534	3.1%	448.3%	3.9%
Divorced	741	5.8%	1,009	6.9%	1,102	6.8%	1,173	6.8%	36.2%	6.4%
Widowed	947	7.4%	879	6.0%	952	5.9%	1,009	5.8%	-7.2%	6.0%
Never Married	2,717	21.2%	3,310	22.6%	3,677	22.7%	3,935	22.7%	21.8%	7.0%

Educational Attainment

	1990 Census		2000 Census		2006 Estimate		2011 Projection		Percent Change	
									1990 to 2000	2006 to 2011
Age 25+ Population	10,584		11,951		13,083		14,343		12.9%	9.6%
Grade K - 8	721	6.8%	449	3.8%	411	3.1%	344	2.4%	-37.7%	-16.3%
Grade 9 - 12	1,105	10.4%	705	5.9%	646	4.9%	598	4.2%	-36.2%	-7.4%
High School Graduate	4,375	41.3%	4,263	35.7%	4,689	35.8%	5,138	35.8%	-2.6%	9.6%
Some College, No Degree	2,093	19.8%	2,901	24.3%	3,066	23.4%	3,238	22.6%	38.6%	5.6%
Associates Degree	655	6.2%	853	7.1%	1,081	8.3%	1,298	9.1%	30.2%	20.1%
Bachelor's Degree	1,253	11.8%	1,936	16.2%	2,293	17.5%	2,677	18.7%	54.5%	16.7%
Graduate Degree	385	3.6%	773	6.5%	897	6.9%	1,050	7.3%	100.8%	17.1%
No Schooling Completed			71	0.6%						

Current year data is for the year 2006, 5 year projected data is for the year 2011. More About Our Data.
Demographic data © 2006 by Experian/Applied Geographic Solutions.

© 2006. DecisionData is brought to you by Decision Data Resources. Technology provided by SRC, LLC.
Privacy Statement | License Agreement

SECTION V

IDENTIFIED PRIORITY AREAS

Identified Priority Areas

1. Priority One: At this time, Washington County is using a formal diversion program for Minor in Possession, Arson and Mutual Assault cases. It has been the desire of Washington County Attorney's Office that a formal diversion program be established for other categories of offenses, including all first time non-violent offenders and truant juveniles and was recommended as a priority.

As part of the diversion program, the County Attorney would initially determine eligibility and then it would be recommended that a standardized instrument be implemented for determining appropriateness of diversion participation. A tool such as the YLS/CMI could be used to determine risk and needs of a juvenile, and if the juvenile would be redirected to formal court proceedings, this tool could follow them because probation and OJS use the same instrument. All of the juveniles in the Washington County diversion programs are referred to outside agencies for educational services, such as alcohol and drug education classes or anger management. If Washington County had the financial resources to hire a Diversion Coordinator, this position would administer the standardized assessment instrument and provide in-house educational services to the diversion participants. The Diversion Coordinator would help facilitate continuity and consistency within the diversion program, toward the participants and within the juvenile justice community.

Statistics for Identified Problem: According to the Washington County Diversion Programs, in 2006, 116 juveniles were referred to the programs, with 108 juveniles successfully completing the programs and the 8 juveniles that did not complete the programs were referred back to the Washington County Attorney's Office resulting in juvenile petitions or criminal charges. For 2005, 129 juveniles were referred to the diversion programs, with 108 juveniles successfully completing the programs and the 11 juveniles that did not complete the programs were referred back to the Washington County Attorney's Office resulting in juvenile petitions or criminal charges. And in 2004, 108 juveniles were referred to the diversion programs, with 104 juveniles successfully completing the programs and the 4 juveniles that did not complete the programs, were referred back to the Washington County Attorney's Office resulting in juvenile petitions or criminal charges.

2. Priority Two: To counteract at-risk and delinquent behaviors without court intervention, it would be recommended that the County research implementation of a community service/mentoring program. Such as "Youth as Resources," a program that allows at-risk juveniles the opportunity to plan community service projects in their respective communities under the direction of adult guidance.

Statistics for Identified Problem: According to US Census Bureau, in 2005, there were 2,294 juveniles in Washington County ages 10-17. According to OJJDP Website State Reports, during this same year, 132 juveniles had been arrested, 67 had been prosecuted, 31 had been adjudicated within the juvenile court system, and 36 had been placed on probation.

3. Priority Three: Due to a lack of detention alternatives in this area, it would be recommended that Washington County explore pre-adjudication alternatives such as electronic monitoring as a cost effective way for the County to minimize detention costs.

Statistics for Identified Problem: According to 2006 records maintained by the Washington County Juvenile Court, 11 juveniles were detained by Washington County, resulting in a county expenditure of \$41,562.90. According to 2005 records maintained by the Washington County Juvenile Court, 3 juveniles were detained by Washington County, resulting in a county expenditure of \$12,402.50. According to 2004 records maintained by the Washington County Juvenile Court, 13 juveniles were detained by Washington County, resulting in a county expenditure of \$47,102.30.

4. Priority Four: Substance Abuse Treatment

Due to the correlation between drug and alcohol abuse by minors and the reality that juvenile delinquency and chemical abuse are associated, chemical abuse and addiction treatment programs are needed in the area. Families are offered mental health counseling through the public schools, but services are not provided for drug and alcohol related issues and funding for education and treatment would help to prevent and eliminate juvenile crime and adjudication.

5. Priority Five: Comprehensive Study and Analysis of County Human Needs.

A comprehensive study and analysis of the County as a whole would assist in ferreting perceived unmet needs from actual needs of Washington County juveniles. Resources are wasted and under utilized when we assume the needs are identified. A comprehensive study and analysis of county-wide human needs would help identify unmet needs and areas in need of improvement.

SECTION VI

STRATEGIES

For each priority area and strategy, the resources of the collective **Team** will be utilized to work on implementation of the strategy, including the LB 1184 Task Force.

1) Diversion Program – To address priority one, Washington County will pursue a grant to create a Diversion Coordinator. The Washington County Diversion Coordinator will facilitate all diversion program services. The County Attorney will manage the program. In addition, the Washington County Diversion Program will utilize a standardized assessment instrument to determine the appropriateness of the juveniles referred to the County Diversion Program by the County Attorney.

2) Community Service Program – The second priority involves the creation of a Community Service Program to counteract juveniles exhibiting at-risk and delinquent behaviors to prevent and eliminate court intervention. Washington County would utilize their Diversion Coordinator to facilitate and manage the Community Service Program. The program would allow local school districts and other agencies to refer juveniles exhibiting at-risk and delinquent behaviors. Duties include coordinating community service projects and direct supervision of participating youth. This position will help manage the Washington County juvenile population of approximately 2,294 youth, of which 2004 statistics indicated made up 132 arrests, 67 prosecutions, 41 adjudications, and 36 probation referrals.

We intend to address the two previous priorities through the creation of a Diversion Coordinator. Our goal is for this position to be supported by funds provided from the County Aid Juvenile Justice Grant. The request for County Aid Juvenile Justice Grant monies will be submitted by Washington County for 2008 as these funds become available in May 2008. We would like to start this program as soon as funds are received and as soon as an employee can be hired for the position. The Project Coordinator will be responsible for the program and the **Team** intends to maintain the use of the grant monies for the preceding years. Other than funding provided from the grant, the County intends to also utilize the revenue created from the Diversion Program. Through the creation of the Diversion Coordinator, the **Team** aims to reduce court referrals of juvenile offenders and costs associated with formal court intervention by the County.

3) Detention Alternative – The third priority involves implementing a pre-adjudication detention alternative for Washington County. This issue was considered a priority due to the amount of County funding being dispersed into geographical locations other than Washington County. Currently, Washington County is spending thousands of dollars to send its youth to detention facilities outside of the County. Washington County has already expended \$68,746.80 for 2007 for out of county detention costs. In the year 2006, Washington County expended \$41,562.90 for out of county detention costs, and in 2005, \$12,402.50 was expended by Washington County for out of county detention costs, while in 2004, \$47,102.30 was expended for out of county detention costs by Washington County. To address this priority, Washington County will seek funds to create a Juvenile Tracker that will provide pre-adjudication alternatives such as electronic monitoring, providing a cost effective way for Washington County to minimize detention costs. Mentors will also be considered

4) **Substance Abuse Treatment Resources** – The fourth priority requires networking and outreaching with mental health chemical addiction counseling service providers to encourage and promote the provider to offer evaluation and treatment services in the County, as well as, seeking funds to make services available to the underprivileged and under served juveniles in need of assistance in the County.

5) **Comprehensive Study and Analysis of Human Needs** – The fifth priority requires the use of a consulting firm and coordination of agencies to determine real needs from perceived needs and whether those actual identified needs are met or unmet.

APPENDIX A

**COMMUNITY PLANNING
DECISION POINT ANALYSIS**

APPENDIX A

**COMMUNITY PLANNING
DECISION POINT ANALYSIS**

Community Planning Decision Point Analysis

Data Points	Total Population (*2000)	Juvenile Population (**2005)
Total Population	18,780	2294
Male	9329	1217
Female	9451	1077
White	18,427	2219
Black/African American	63	25
Asian	55	4
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	21	Not available
American Indian	38	8
Hispanic	202	38
Juveniles Arrested		132
Juveniles Detained		18 (2005-2006)
Juveniles Prosecuted		67
Juveniles Placed in Diversion		240 (2005-2006)
Number of Juveniles Adjudicated		41
Number of Juveniles placed on Probation		36
YRTC-Kearney commitments		3 (2005-2006)
YRTC-Geneva commitments		0

Sources:

*2000 U.S. Census Data

**2005 OJJDP website 2005 DMC Federal Reports (Ages 10-17)

System Decision Point: Arrest/Citation: Law Enforcement

Decision: *Whether an information report should be filed, or what offense, if any, with which juvenile should be cited or arrested*

Formal Determining Factors

- Sufficient factual basis to believe offense committed
- Underlying support for a particular offense

Informal Determining Factors

- Youth's prior incidences with law enforcement-institutional memory and review of prior law enforcement reports
- Blair schools have a school resource officer which is paid 1/2 by department and 1/2 by school funding
- Arlington and Fort Calhoun schools have school resource officer present
- Law enforcement lists contacts in their respective systems
- If it is truancy related issue, law enforcement goes to homes to convince juvenile to come to school
- Contact between law enforcement and probation officers regarding status of juvenile and intake

Decision: *Whether to cite or arrest juvenile for juvenile or adult offense*

Formal Determining Factors

- Seriousness of offense
- Age
- Probation Detainer interview
- Prior contacts with law enforcement
- Status (ie- prior probabtion/juv. parole)

Informal Determining Factors

- Victim's desire
- County Attorney determines law enforcement provides sufficient information in their written narrative
- Strength of case (evidence, witness credibility)
- Community input (law enforcement, parents, school, other involved agencies/parties)

Decision: *Whether to take juvenile into custody or to cite and release (NRS § 43-248(1), (2); § 43-250(1), (2), (3))*

Formal Determining Factors

- As stated in above referenced Statutes

Informal Determining Factors

- Immediate risk to juvenile
- Immediate/short term risk to public
- Seriousness of perceived offense
- Extent to which parent or other responsible adult available to take responsibility for juvenile
- Law enforcement contacts parents on every case to notify them of contact.

System Decision Point: Initial Detention: State of Nebraska Probation

Decision: *Whether juvenile should be detained or released*

Formal Determining Factors

- Risk assessment outcome
- Accessibility of placement options: parent's/guardians, emergency shelter, staff secure facility, secure detention facility

Informal Determining Factors

- Madison County Detention center is the 1st priority contract, Douglas County is the 2nd, and Lancaster County 3rd
- Use Jefferson House for uncontrollable juveniles
- Probation uses screening tool as designed to determine appropriate placement.
- Probation confident the screening tool is sufficient in determining correct placement.
- Probation will use override option if Necessary

System Decision Point: Charge Juvenile: County Attorney

Decision: *Whether to prosecute juvenile*

Formal Determining Factors

- Likelihood of successful prosecution
- Factors under NRS § 43-276

Informal Determining Factors

- Does have a formal diversion program for Minor in Possession, Arson & Mutual Assault cases
- Truancy issues are diverted from the justice system due to successful communication between schools, County Attorney Office and family
- Prior contacts (number, nature and time between prior contacts) influence filing decisions by County Attorney
- Blair school has a contract for counseling which allows families 2 free counseling sessions with contracted service provider
- Communication and exchange of information between County Attorney Office, NHHS, Probation and Law Enforcement

Decision: *Whether youth should be prosecuted as juvenile or adult*

Formal Determining Factors

- Seriousness of offense
- It is case dependent based on statutory

Informal Determining Factors

- Prior contacts with juvenile
- Knowledge of involvement with voluntary requirements services and success of those services

Decision: *Offense for which juvenile should be charged*

Formal Determining Factors

- As outlined in statute

Informal Determining Factors

- Excellent collaboration and cooperation allow for a free flow of information between County Attorney and law enforcement to consider and evaluation when making charging decisions

System Decision Point: Pre-adjudication detention: Juvenile Court Judge

Decision: *Whether juvenile detained at the time of citation/arrest should continue in detention or out-of-home placement pending adjudication*

Formal Determining Factors

- Whether there is an "immediate and urgent necessity for the protection of such juvenile"
- Whether there is an "immediate and urgent necessity for the protection of identified victims and society or property of another"
- Whether the juvenile is likely to flee the jurisdiction of the court
- Probation detention intake worksheet

Informal Determining Factors

- Minimal pre-adjudication alternatives to detentions available for the county (Jefferson House, Masonic Home)
- Safety needs of juvenile, family, the person

System Decision Point: Probable Cause Hearing: Juvenile Court Judge

Decision: *Whether State can show that probable cause exists that juvenile is within the jurisdiction of the court*

Formal Determining Factors

- As stated in statute

Informal Determining Factors

- No factors reported

System Decision Point: Competency Evaluation: Juvenile Court Judge

Decision: *Whether juvenile is competent to participate in the proceedings*

Formal Determining Factors

-As stated in statute

Informal Determining Factors

- Information provided by NHHS,
Probation Law enforcement and family

Decision: *Whether juvenile is "responsible" for his/her acts*

Formal Determining Factors

- "Complete evaluation of the juvenile including any authorized area of inquiry requested by the court."
- Opinion of physician, surgeon, psychiatrist, community mental health program, psychologist

Informal Determining Factors

- If they need to place a juvenile for other mental health issues, they will send them to Sarpy County

System Decision Point: Adjudication: Juvenile Court Judge

Decision: *Whether the juvenile is, beyond a reasonable doubt, "a person described by § 43-247"*

Formal Determining Factors

- Legal sufficiency of evidence presented during adjudication hearing
- Whether juvenile admits the allegations of the petition (or, "pleads to the charges")
- Residency
- Age

Informal Determining Factors

- Only has juvenile court 1x a week
- Judge is very patient with juveniles in their first time appearances

Decision: *Whether to order probation to conduct a pre-disposition investigation (statutory authority unclear--see also: § 29-2261 (2))*

Formal Determining Factors

-As stated in statute

Informal Determining Factors

- PDI's are not ordered as standard Procedure

Decision: *Whether to order OJS evaluation*

Formal Determining Factors

- NRS § 29-2204 (3): "Prior to making a disposition which commits the juvenile to the Office of Juvenile Services, the court shall order the juvenile to be evaluated by the office if the juvenile has not had an evaluation within the past twelve months

Informal Determining Factors

- OJS is mostly secondary practice
- It was stated the quality of OJS evaluations is poor
- Screening instrument used by HHS "worthless"-it directs most cases to probation & fails to adequately address the treatment alternatives already provided through voluntary services and family efforts
- Informal/voluntary measures have proven inadequate

Decision: *Whether to order a PDI and an OJS Evaluation*

Formal Determining Factors

- As stated in statute

Informal Determining Factors

- Natural progression of cases is to start with PDI's and then order an OJS evaluation
- Information communicated from collateral sources (schools, NHHS, Law Enforcement, family, community members, Probation Office)

System Decision Point:Disposition: Juvenile Court Judge

Decision: *Whether to place juvenile on probation*

Formal Determining Factors

- As outlined in statute

Informal Determining Factors

- Most juvenile cases have disposition of probation

Decision: *Whether to commit juvenile to the Office of Juvenile Services*

Formal Determining Factors

- Whether juvenile is at least twelve years of age and whether removal from home is a likely outcome

Informal Determining Factors

- If the court is wanting provide services then will commit to OJS, to include out-of-home placement

Decision: *Whether to place juvenile on probation and commit juvenile to HHS or OJS*

Formal Determining Factors

- As outlined in statute

Informal Determining Factors

- Judge does not regularly order dual commitment cases, but County Attorney believes he does when situation's appropriate

System Decision Point: Administrative Sanctions: Probation

Decision: *Whether to impose administrative sanctions on a probationer*

Formal Determining Factors

- Probation officers has reasonable cause to believe that probationer has committed or is about to commit a substance abuse violation or a non criminal violation
- Substance abuse violation refers to a positive test for drug or alcohol use, failure to report for such a test or failure to comply with substance abuse evaluations or treatment

Informal Determining Factors

- Probation uses administrative sanctions for juveniles

System Decision Point: Motion To Revoke Probation: County Attorney

Decision: *Whether to file a motion to revoke probation*

Formal Determining Factors

- As outlined in statute

Informal Determining Factors

- A new petition is filed if a new charge is the reason for the motion to revoke in addition to the MTR petition

System Decision Point: Modification/Revocation of Probation: Juvenile Court Judge

Decision: *Whether to modify or revoke probation*

Formal Determining Factors

- As outlined in statute

Informal Determining Factors

- Most cases are modified to a higher level of care

System Decision Point: Setting Aside Adjudication: Juvenile Court Judge

Decision: *Whether juvenile has satisfactorily completed his or her probation and supervision or the treatment program of his or her commitment*

Formal Determining Factors

- Juvenile's post-adjudication behavior for and response to treatment and rehabilitation programs
- Whether setting aside adjudication will depreciate seriousness of juvenile's conduct or promote

Informal Determining Factors

- Judge usually sets a determinate time probation cases

disrespect for the law

- Whether failure to set aside adjudication may result in consequences disproportionate to the conduct upon which the adjudication was based

Decision: *Whether juvenile should be discharged from custody and supervision of OJS*

Formal Determining Factors

- Presumably same as those for probation

Informal Determining Factors

- Despite OJS statutory discharge regulations, there is good communication and rapport between justice professionals with OJS juveniles especially regarding placement

Summary/Recommendations:

Juvenile justice officials representing Washington County met on January 12, 2007 to discuss the development of their Juvenile Comprehensive plan. Representatives included County Attorney's Office, Law Enforcement, Probation and schools. Information was provided by the respective agencies to complete the system analysis tool as a part of the juvenile comprehensive planning process. As a result of this conversation the following recommendations are for consideration:

- 1) At this time, Washington County is using an formal diversion program for Minor in Possession, Arson and Mutual Assault cases. It is recommended that a formal diversion program be established for other categories of offenses, including all first time non-violent offenders.
- 2) Due to lack of detention alternatives in this area, it would be recommended that Washington County look into pre-adjudication alternatives such as electronic monitoring. This is a cost effective way for the county to minimize detention costs.
- 3) To counteract at-risk and delinquent behaviors without court intervention, it would be recommended that the County research implementation of a community service/mentoring program. Such as "Youth as Resources," a program that allows at risk juveniles the opportunity to plan community service projects in their respective communities under the direction of adult guidance.
- 4) Due to families having opportunities to utilize mental health counseling through the school, it would be recommended that similar services be offered for drug and alcohol related issues. Possible funding could be used for drug and alcohol evaluations and treatment at approved service providers.
- 5) Mentoring programs for juveniles are a best practice curriculum. TeamMates should be continued in the Blair schools with the possibility of other Washington County schools

offering the same opportunity to other Washington County Schools.

6) A comprehensive study and analysis of the county as whole would assist in ferreting out the perceived unmet needs from the actual unmet needs of Washington County juveniles.